UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,119	11/25/2003	Amit Raikar	200300497-1	1279

22879   7590   11/21/2008
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
HOFFMAN, BRANDON S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2436	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/21/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
mkraft@hp.com
ipa.mail@hp.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/723,119	RAIKAR ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BRANDON S. HOFFMAN	2436	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>19 August 2008</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is FINAL.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-24 are pending in this office action.

2.   Applicant's arguments, filed August 19, 2008, have been fully considered but
they are not persuasive.

Claim Rejections

3.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can
be found in a prior office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   Claims 1-4, 20, 21, 23, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a/e) as being
anticipated by Lineman et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0065942).

        Regarding claim 1, Lineman et al. teaches a method/computer system
comprising:

- Describing a plurality of password policies in a computer usable password policy
  data structure (fig. 6A and 6B):

- Accessing said computer usable password policy data structure by a password
  policy enforcement agent (paragraph 0083); and

- Enforcing at least one of said plurality of password policies described within said password policy data structure by said password policy enforcement agent (paragraph 0095).

Regarding claim 20, Lineman et al. teaches instructions on a computer usable medium wherein the instructions when executed cause a computer system to perform a method of establishing a consistent password policy, said method comprising:

- Describing a plurality of password policies in a computer usable password policy data structure (fig. 6A and 6B);
- Providing an access point with access to said computer usable password policy data structure (paragraph 0083); and
- Receiving feedback from a password policy enforcement agent associated with said access point about which of said plurality of password policies have been successfully enforced (paragraph 0095 and fig. 2, ref. num 84).

Regarding claim 23, Lineman et al. teaches a method/computer system comprising:

- Computer usable media comprising computer usable instructions that when executed on a processor of said first server computer implement a method of establishing a consistent password policy, said method comprising (fig. 6A and 6B):

- Accessing a computer usable password policy data structure by a password policy enforcement agent (paragraph 0083); and

- Enforcing a password policy described within said password policy data structure by said password policy enforcement agent (paragraph 0095).

Regarding <u>claims 2 and 21</u>, <u>Lineman et al.</u> teaches wherein said computer usable password policy data structure comprises a file structure compatible with extensible markup language (fig. 6A and 6B).

Regarding <u>claim 3</u>, <u>Lineman et al.</u> teaches wherein said password policy enforcement agent is operable on a client computer of a client-server computer system (paragraph 0030 and fig. 1, ref. num 28).

Regarding <u>claims 4 and 24</u>, <u>Lineman et al.</u> teaches wherein said method is operable on a utility data center (fig. 1).

Regarding <u>claim 5</u>, <u>Lineman et al.</u> teaches further comprising validating said computer usable password policy data structure for authenticity by said password policy enforcement agent (paragraph 0091).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lineman

et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0065942) in view of Cole et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No.

2002/0161707).

        Regarding claim 19, Lineman et al. teaches all the limitations of claim 1, above.

However, Lineman et al. does not teach further comprising providing, by said password

policy enforcement agent, feedback to a configuration and aggregation point, about

which of said plurality of password policies have been successfully enforced.

        Cole et al. teaches further comprising providing, by said password policy

enforcement agent, feedback to a configuration and aggregation point, about which of

said plurality of password policies have been successfully enforced (paragraph 0083).

        It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the

invention was made, to combine providing feedback for successful enforcement, as

taught by Cole et al., with the method of Lineman et al. It would have been obvious for

such modifications because feedback informs the user/administrator that the policy

being enforced is working.

        Claims 5-18 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Lineman et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0065942) in view of Password Policy of

eRA (referred to as Password Policy hereinafter).

Regarding <u>claims 5-18 and 22</u>, <u>Lineman et al.</u> teaches all the limitations of claims

1 and 20, above. However, <u>Lineman et al.</u> does not teach specific policy types.

<u>Password Policy</u> teaches comprising a computer access password policy

parameter selected from the set of computer access password policy parameters

comprising: a threshold parameter for unsuccessful access attempts that when

exceeded disables a computer system access account; a parameter indicating the a

time duration within which said threshold parameter number of unsuccessful access

attempts triggers locking of a computer system access account; an initial delay

parameter to block access to a computer system access account for a period of time

after an unsuccessful access attempt; a minimum password length parameter; a

maximum password length parameter; a parameter to prohibit passwords consisting of

a natural language word; a parameter to prohibit passwords consisting of a palindrome;

a parameter to prohibit passwords consisting of a derivative of a computer system

account name; a parameter to automatically generate a password; a parameter to

automatically generate a pronounceable password consistent with all of said plurality of

password policies; and a parameter to specify a set of characters utilizable to

automatically generate a password (page 2-4, section 5.0 through 5.5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the

invention was made, to combine a plurality of different password policies, as taught by

<u>Password Policy</u>, with the method/computer system of <u>Lineman et al.</u> It would have

been obvious for such modifications because the policies taught by <u>Password Policy</u>

reduce the risk of unauthorized access to servers and databases (see page 1, section

1.0 of Password Policy).

Response to Arguments

6.

    a.   Applicant's argue the combination of references do not teach enforcing at

    least one of said plurality of password policies by said password policy

    enforcement agent (see page 10 of applicant's arguments).

    b.   The remaining sets of claims have been argued based on the same

    arguments by applicant (see page 11-12 of applicant's arguments).

    Regarding argument (a), examiner disagrees. Figure 1 of Lineman et al. clearly

shows a security server (30) that contains a program (32), which controls computer

systems (26). The program (32) on the security server (30) acts as the password policy

enforcement agent as claimed. Figure 2 and the accompanying description better

describe the process of program (32) running on security server (30), specifically

paragraph 0038.

        The security administrator then uses the security management program 32 to verify a degree of

    compliance with the security policies demonstrated by the computer systems 26 (block 92). The security

    management program 32 enables the administrator to set or audit the parameters on the computer systems 26

    (block 94). The administrator may run a checkup report to measure or change the parameters on the computer

    systems 26 (block 96). Additionally, the administrator may set the parameters on the computer systems 26 in

    response to the measurement to make the systems compliant with the policy. Additionally, detect rules may be

configured when creating the security policy document and may be communicated to the computer systems 26,

instructing the agent software 28 on the computer systems 26 to notify the security management program 32 of

any future changes in configuration of the security parameters on the systems (block 98).

Paragraph 0083 provides additional support to show the security server (30) and its program (32) are in control of enforcing policy matters.

In combination with or independent from publishing the security policy document to the users 54, the

disclosed software publishes the security policy document to the security server 30 having the security

management program 32. As previously noted, the security management program 32 is used to set and audit

the security policies of the document on the various computer systems 26 of the platforms 20, 22, 24.

Additionally, the security management program 32 is used to review detect rules, which are automatically

created to enforce the policy of the platforms 20, 22, 24. In publishing the security policy document to the

security management program 32, the policy management program 42 extracts the technical and platform

controls from the XML file representing the security policy in the machine-readable form. The technical and

platform controls populate the databases, files, and routines associated with the security management program

32. Using the technical and platform controls, the security administrator may verify compliance of the computer

systems 26 and set/audit the systems from within the security management program 32.

Regarding argument (b), examiner disagrees. The remaining claims are rejected in view of the same reasons as set forth above.

Conclusion

7.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to BRANDON S. HOFFMAN whose telephone number is

(571)272-3863. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Nasser G. Moazzami can be reached on 571-272-4195. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Brandon S Hoffman/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2436